



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

which suffered for our sins, and which the Father raised by his bounty." Thus this disciple of the Apostle wrote, who certainly knew the meaning of their doctrine. In the same age St. Justin Martyr, in his apology to the heathen Emperor for the Christian religion, affirms, "that as our Saviour Jesus Christ was himself by the word made flesh, and took for our salvation both flesh and blood, so we are taught that the eucharist is the flesh and blood of the same Jesus incarnate." (*Apolog. 2. ad Antoninum.*) Would any man in his senses write thus to a heathen if he understood Christ's words in a figurative sense? In the same age, St. Irenæus, in his fifth book (chap. xi.) against heresies, speaking of the bread and wine says—"that by the Word of God they are made the Eucharist, which is the body and blood of Christ." In the third age, St. Cyprian, in his sermon on the Lord's supper, says, "the bread which our Lord gave to his disciples being changed, not in shape, but in substance, by the omnipotency of the word, is made flesh." He likewise says (*Lib. de Orat. Domini*) "that in the eucharist we eat Christ's body, and drink his blood." In the same age, the learned Origen tells us (*Hom. 7. in Levit.*) that "in the old law the manna was a figurative food (in *enigma*); but now the flesh of God is meat (in specie) in reality, as he himself says, 'my flesh is meat indeed.'" He speaks no less plainly in many other places. In the same age, Tertullian says (*L. 4. Cont. Marcion. c. 40.*) "that the bread which Christ took at his last supper, and distributed to his disciples, he changed into his body." In the fourth age, the great St. John Chrysostom delivered in more clear terms the doctrine of the Catholic Church. In his eighty-third homily upon St. Matthew, he has these excellent words: "let us everywhere believe Almighty God, nor contradict him, though what he says seems contradictory to our reason and sense. His words cannot deceive us; our senses are easily deceived: his words never err; our senses are frequently mistaken. Since, therefore, he says, 'this is my body,' let us be persuaded of it. He who did these things at his last supper, the same now performs them; we are only his ministers; it is he who sanctifies; it is he who transmutes or changes these things." Thus writes St. Chrysostom, whose words are equally plain in several places of his excellent works.

Let us now give ear to St. Ambrose, another famous doctor of the Church, in the same age, in his book, "De his qui mysteris initiantur," chapter the ninth—"Perhaps you will say," says he, "I see quite another thing. How do you assure me that I receive the body of Christ? And this is what remains for us to prove. How great," says he, "are the examples which we used to show—that it is not the thing which nature formed, but the thing which the blessing has consecrated, and that the blessing has greater force than nature, because by the blessing even nature itself is changed." Afterwards he instances, or makes mention of the change of rods into serpents, and of water into wine, and thus pursues his discourse: "if," says he, "the words of Elias were powerful enough to command fire down from heaven, shall not, therefore, the words of Christ be able to change the nature of the elements? You have read of the whole creation—he said, and they were made; he commanded, and they were created; the word, therefore, of Christ, which could make out of nothing that which was not, cannot it change those things which are into what they are not?" Thus, St. Ambrose, not only proposes but proves the doctrine of the Catholic Church. In the same age, St. Gregory Nyssen, in his catechetical discourse, professed the same faith. "I do believe" says he, "that, by the word of God, the sanctified bread is changed into the body and blood of Christ."

In the same age, St. Cyril, patriarch of Jerusalem, discourses thus of the Eucharist (*Cat. Mys. fourth.*)—"Do not consider it," says he, "as mere bread and wine, for now it is the body and blood of Christ, according to our Lord's own words." Again, "Judge not the thing," says he, "by the taste." And, a little after, "knowing," says he, "and holding for certain, that the bread and wine which we see is not bread, although it taste like bread, but it is the body of Christ." What Catholic of this present age can express in plainer terms than this saint has done, our faith of transubstantiation? In the fifth age, that great doctor of the Church, St. Augustine, in Psalm thirty-third, says—"How David could be carried in his own hands we know not, but in Christ we do; for he was carried in his own hands, when, at his last supper, he gave to his disciples his own body and blood, saying—'This is my body'; for he then carried his own body in his own hands."

Every one of these fathers, dear sir, which I have here quoted, lived above thirteen hundred years ago, and were certainly better qualified to know the sense of the Scriptures, and doctrine of the apostles, than those who came but lately into the world. And all the rest of the fathers, in all succeeding ages, unanimously agreed in the same doctrine; so that this article of our faith is as ancient as the apostles.

The institution of the blessed Eucharist is related in three different evangelists, viz., by St. Matthew (*c. xxvi. v. 26.*); by St. Mark (*c. xiv.*); and by St. Luke (*c. xxii.*); and St. Paul, in his first epistle to the Corinthians (*c. xi.*). Here dear sir, we may expect to find something decisive on this point. I shall now conclude, dear Mr. Editor, by exhorting every one to "remember the days of old; consider the years of many generations. Let us ask our elders, and they will tell us. Let us stand in the ways, and see, and walk for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk

therein;" for there is no other way, our divines tell us, which can conduct us safely to the joys of heaven.

Dear Mr. Editor, be pleased to give me an answer to this letter, that I may know your opinion also on this subject.

Your humble and obedient

JOHN DUFFEY.

Our correspondent has requested us to state our opinion on the passages which he cites from the fathers, relating to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. We have been put to some trouble by his omission of the editions and pages of the volumes to which he refers, as we cannot, in general, undertake to discuss passages which are quoted so vaguely as those given in his letter. In consequence of the crowded state of our columns, our remarks must necessarily be very brief.

Our correspondent asks—"What [Roman] Catholic of the present age could express our faith in transubstantiation in plainer terms than St. Cyril, and others of the Greek and Latin fathers?" In order to ascertain, therefore, whether the ancient fathers really believed in transubstantiation, it is necessary, in the first place, to call to mind the definition which the Council of Trent have given of this word. It is, say they, "a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ; and of the whole substance of the wine, into the substance of his blood" (*Conc. Trid. Sess. xiii. Can. 2.*). And to the same effect, the catechism of the Council of Trent declares, that, "not only the true body of Christ, and whatever pertains to the character of a true body, as bones and sinews (*ossa et nervos*), but that Christ, whole and entire, is contained in this sacrament" (*Cat. Rom. II. iv. § 83.*) Bearing these things in mind, let us examine the passages cited from the fathers by our correspondent.

His first authority is Ignatius, who says that "the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ." Does this passage necessarily imply, that the substance of the bread is *changed* into the actual body, bones, and sinews of our Lord? Surely not. St. Paul, in speaking of the rock in the wilderness, says—"That rock was Christ" (*1 Cor. x. 4.*) And how does St. Augustine interpret these words? "The thing that signifieth," saith he, "is commonly called by the name of that thing that it signifieth; therefore is it that St. Paul saith, 'The rock was Christ.' For he saith not, the rock signified Christ, but, the rock was Christ, as if the rock had been Christ indeed; whereas, *touching the substance it was not so, but so it was by signification*" (*per substantiam non hoc erat, sed per significationem.*—*Op. Tom. iii. col. 516.*) It is in this manner that Ignatius calls the Eucharist "the flesh of our Saviour Christ," not physically, but as St. Augustine saith, "The sacrament of Christ's body, *after a certain manner of speech*, is the body of Christ" (*Secundum q:emdam modum, sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est.*—*Op. Par. 1679;* *Tom. ii. col. 267.*)

Again, St. Chrysostom, in writing of the sacrament of baptism, says, "St. Paul sheweth in this place (*Heb. ix. 19.*), the blood (of Christ) and the water (of baptism) are the same" (*δεικνυσιν ενταῦθα το ἀυτῷ οὐ καὶ ἄρτα καὶ ὕδωρ.*—*Tom. xii. 228, Par. 1838.*) Does he mean that the water of baptism is *changed* into Christ's blood? Certainly not; but each borrows the name of the other; because they are joined together in one mystery. The water is called Christ's blood, because it is a sacrament of that blood; and so Ignatius writes, that the Eucharist is the flesh of Christ, because it is the sacrament of his body.

That this is the true principle upon which this and other similar passages are to be interpreted, is evident from a passage in the epistle of the same writer, Ignatius, to the Romans, § 7:—"The drink of God I desire, even his blood, *which is incorruptible love and eternal life*" (*τὸ ἄρτα ἀυτοῦ, ὁ εστιν ἀγαπὴ αφθαρτὸς καὶ αείναιος ζωῆς.*) Is, then, the blood of Christ actually incorruptible love and eternal life? No, surely; but it is the sacramental pledge and token of these blessings, to all faithful believers. A physical change or transmutation, or an assertion of actual identity, would, in this case, be simply absurd.

The fallacy which we have just pointed out, runs through most Roman Catholic interpretations of the passages of the Fathers which are quoted on this subject. Whenever an ancient writer states that Christians, in the Eucharist, partake of the body and blood of Christ, Roman Catholic controversialists at once exclaim, "This writer must have believed in transubstantiation." But this is a great mistake. The Church of England holds just as firmly as the ancient Fathers ever did, that "the body and blood of Christ are *verily and indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper" (*Catech.*); but the whole question turns on the *manner* of the reception. When any ancient Father of the first five centuries can be produced, who states, as the catechism of the Council of Trent does, that the bread and wine are changed into the *body, blood, bones, and sinews* of Christ, we will be content to avow our error, but not till then.

We need not dwell on the passage which our correspondent quotes from Justin Martyr, as its real meaning will be sufficiently evident from what we have just said. A few lines before, Justin had said, "This food is among us called the Eucharist, for we take not these as common bread, or as common drink." Do not these words sufficiently imply that Justin considered the sacramental

bread to be still *bread*, after consecration, "although it was no longer *common* bread? and if this be so, is it not plainly manifest that he could not have believed in transubstantiation?

The same remarks apply to Irenæus. In the passage quoted by our correspondent, (which is in *lib. v. c. ii. p. 400, Ox. 1702.*), that ancient Father had said, that "the Eucharist is the body and blood of Christ." But if our correspondent had taken the trouble to refer to one or two other passages of the same writer, even he, we should imagine, could not have mistaken his true meaning. Thus, for example, Irenæus writes (*lib. iv. c. 34, p. 327.*)—"Bread, which is from the earth, receiving the vocation of God, is now not common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly thing and a heavenly thing." (*Qui est a terra panis, percipiens vocationem Dei, jam non communis panis est, sed eucharistia, ex duabus rebus constantis, terrena et coelesti.*) Irenæus, like his predecessor Justin Martyr, and his successor Cyril of Jerusalem, denies that, after consecration, the eucharistic bread and wine are any longer common bread and common drink; but he speaks, as the voice of antiquity fully teaches, of their moral or sacramental change from a secular application to a holy purpose, not of their physical or material change from mere bread and wine into Christ's literal body and blood—a change, which the fact of his calling the sacramental element bread, *after consecration*, sufficiently disposes.

Hitherto, our correspondent had gone pretty regularly through the list of the Fathers, but now he makes a great jump, from Irenæus to Cyprian. Was there, then, no writer of eminence between these? There was; one of remarkable ability, whom Cyprian was wont to call his master, the well-known Tertullian. And does not Mr. Duffey refer to him? He does, a little lower down; but we request the special attention of our readers to the fact, that he stops short in the middle of a sentence, which, if quoted entire, would, instead of proving transubstantiation, have furnished a conclusive argument *against* it, so far as Tertullian's authority goes. The passage, as quoted by Mr. Duffey, runs thus—"The bread which Christ took at his last supper, and distributed to his disciples, he changed into his body." Here Mr. Duffey's quotation stops; but what follows in the original? "he changed into his body, saying—This is my body"—*that is a figure of my body!* (*Corpus illum suum fecit, hoc est corpus meum dicendo, id est, figura corporis mei.* *Adv. Marc. iv. 40, p. 458, Par. 1675.*) What will Mr. Duffy now say to the authority of this ancient writer, one of his own chosen witnesses?

If, according to Tertullian, the sacramental elements were only changed into a *figure* of Christ's body, it is pretty plain that he could not have believed, as the Catechism of the Council of Trent declares, that the bread and wine are actually changed and transmuted into the flesh, bones, and sinews of the Lord Jesus Christ—that is, he was no believer in transubstantiation. Is it fair or reasonable, we ask, to quote an ancient writer as holding a particular doctrine, when, if his words were given entire, they would prove that he held the very opposite? Mr. Duffey's letter is written in such an earnest and candid spirit, that we entirely acquit him of any dishonesty in this matter. He has borrowed the quotation, we have no doubt, from some controversial book, the name of which, for the sake of his own character, he ought to send us. The original author who stopped so conveniently short when it suited his purpose, was certainly no lover of truth, and we grieve to say, this is not the first occasion on which we have detected Roman Catholic writers in similar dishonesty of quotation.

But Tertullian does not stand alone. Precisely similar language regarding the Eucharist is found in St. Augustine, whom Mr. Duffey claims as one of his authorities. He, too, writes as follows:—"Our Lord doubted not to say—'This is my body,' when he gave a *token* of his body." (*Non dubitavit Dominus dicere, hoc est corpus meum, cum daret signum corporis sui.* (*Op. Tom. viii. col. 124.*) It is clear, from this passage alone, if there were no others, that St. Augustine was no believer in transubstantiation.

Our remarks have run to such a length on this interesting subject, that we are unwillingly obliged to defer the consideration of the other passages cited by Mr. Duffey to some future opportunity. We had intended especially to prove that St. Ambrose, whom our correspondent claims so triumphantly as one of his main authorities, had to be *expurgated* by the Romish editors in one important passage, which was utterly irreconcileable with the dogma of transubstantiation. We hope to refer, however, to this topic hereafter; meanwhile, what we have said will, we trust, enable our correspondent and our Roman Catholic readers generally, to perceive in what sense the Fathers, in the old time, understood these words of our blessed Lord—"This is my body."

WHAT IS THE UNANIMOUS CONSENT OF THE FATHERS?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR.—The 2nd article of Pope Pius IV.'s creed thus concludes:—

"Nec eam [*Scripturam*] unquam nisi juxta unanimem consensum Patrum accipiam et interpretabor;" which Mr. Butler translates—"Nor will I ever take or interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers."

Perhaps you or some of your Roman Catholic correspondents would kindly explain the meaning of the (apparently) plain word "unanimous."

If it means, as it generally does, "agreed in or to by all," it would seem that the opinion of even one Father in the explanation of a text, must, if opposed to all others, be sufficient to prevent any use being made of that text by members of the Church of Rome.

Take, for example, the principal text brought forward by that Church in support of St. Peter's primacy, and its own infallibility—"And I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church."—St. Matt. xvi. 18, R. C. version.

The note on this text in the Douay Bible says—"By the plain course of the words Peter is here declared to be the rock upon which the Church was to be built."

St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine give a directly contrary interpretation. St. Chrysostom says (Op. Tom. vii., Benedictine ed., p. 548)—*Tu πέτρα τούτη την πίστει τής ὁμολογίας*—(The rock, that is the *faith of his confession*. See also Opp. Tom. viii., p. 785-6.)

St. Augustine says (Serm. 66, cap. ii., de verbis Evang., Matt.)—"Tu ergo, inquit, es Petrus, et super hanc petram quam confessus es, super hanc petram quam cognovisti, dicens, Tu es Christus Filius Dei vivi, ædificabo ecclesiam meam." "Thou, therefore, he says, art Peter, and upon this rock which thou hast confessed—upon this which thou hast recognized, saying, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God—I will build my Church." (Op. S. Aug. Tom. v. col. 415, ed. Ben.)

Again (Serm. de sanctis. 295, i.)—"Super hanc petram ædificabo fidem, quam confiteris. Super hoc quod dixisti, Tu es Christus Filius Dei vivi, ædificabo ecclesiam meam." (Tom. v. col. 1194.)

"Upon this rock I will build the faith thou didst confess—upon this which thou hast said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God—I will build my Church."

A Romanist who holds the creed of Pope Pius IV. cannot, I think, interpret this passage in opposition to Chrysostom and Augustine, and is, therefore debarred from the interpretation given by the Romish note.

J. R. D. B.

We do not see how this difficulty is to be got over. If we could have the unanimous consent of the Popes on this passage of Scripture, it still would not come up to what the creed of Pope Pius requires. Yet, even this much consent we cannot have, though one would think that the Popes, at least, might agree among themselves about the interpretation of this passage, but they do not. Some of the Popes say Christ is the rock; some say Peter is the rock; some say the See of Rome is the rock. Pope Gelasius, in the 5th century, alluding to Matthew xvi. 18—"that word which promised that the gates of hell should never prevail against the *confession* of the blessed apostle Peter." So here the confession of faith in Christ is the rock (Ep. 1, Labbe and Coss., vol. iv., p. 1158); and Pope Gregory the Great says, "found your life on the rock of the Church—that is, on the *confession* of blessed Peter, the chief of the apostles" (Labbe and Coss., vol. v., p. 1157); and Pope Hormisdas says—"when many have separated themselves from the firmness of that rock, which is Christ" (Labbe and Coss., vol. vi., p. 1459); and Pope Felix III. represents St. Peter himself as speaking thus of Christ—"who promised that the gates of hell should never prevail against his Church, founded on my *confession*" (Labbe and Coss., vol. iv., p. 1053). That confession was—"thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." We believe that the confession of this is, indeed, the rock on which Christ founded his Church.

Can any of our correspondents give us the interpretation of these words—"on this rock I will build my Church," according to the creed of Pope Pius IV., that is, according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers?

PURGATORY, AND THE PRACTICE OF PRAYING FOR THE DEAD, PROVED FROM THE FATHERS OF THE FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD CENTURIES, ETC.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—The writings of the holy Fathers of both the Eastern and Western Churches, most clearly prove, that, from the earliest dawn of Christianity, the belief of a purgatory was general in the Church. Tertullian, the famous champion of the Christian religion, who lived in the second age, says, "No man will doubt but that the soul doth recompense something in the places below."—*Lib. de Anima*, c. 58. And, again, in his book, "De Corona Militis," "We make yearly oblations for the dead." St. Clement, in the same age, tells us St. Peter "taught them, among other works of mercy, to bury the dead and diligently perform their funeral rites; and also to pray and give alms for them."—Epist. 1st. de St. Petro. In the third age, St. Cyprian says, "It is one thing being cast into a prison, not to go out thence till he pays the utmost farthing—another, presently to receive the reward of faith; one thing, being afflicted with long pains for sins to be mended and purged long with fire—another, to have purged all sins by suffering."—Epis. 52, ad Anton. In the same age, Origen says—"Though a release from prison be promised, St. Mat. v., yet it is signified that none can get out from thence but he who pays the utmost farthing."—Epist. ad

Roman. et Hom. iii. St. Luc. In the fourth age, St. Ambrose says—"But where, as St. Paul says, 'yet so as by fire' he shows, indeed, that he shall be saved, but yet shall suffer the punishment of fire; that being purged by fire he may be saved and not tormented for ever, as the infidels are, with everlasting fire."—Cap. iii. Ephes. ad Cor. In the same age: "This is that (says St. Jerome) which he saith thou shalt not go out of prison till thou shalt pay even thy little sins."—Matt. v. In the same age, St. Cyril, of Jerusalem, says, "We beseech God for all those who have died before us, believing the obsecration of that holy and dreadful sacrifice which is put on the altar to be the greatest help of the souls for which it is offered."—Catech. Mysagog. v. Again, in the same age, the above-quoted St. Jerome says—"These things were not in vain ordained by the apostles, that in the venerable and dreadful mysteries of the mass, there should be made a memory of those who have departed this life; they knew much benefit would hence accrue to them."—Hom. iii. Epist. ad Phil.

Indeed, Mr. Editor, it would fill volumes to quote all those passages from the holy Fathers, which prove the belief in a third place, and prayers for the dead to be coeval with Christianity.

Those I have quoted, lived twelve, thirteen, and fourteen centuries before the Reformation, and were, of course, as good judges of genuine apostolical tradition as the gentlemen of the Reformation could be.

If these holy and learned doctors, some of whom were the immediate successors of the apostles, did not think themselves guilty of superstition in praying for the dead, but declared, that in doing so they followed and obeyed the ordinances of the apostles, neither do we think ourselves guilty of superstition, in believing and doing, as they did. "He who soweth sparingly, shall reap sparingly; and he who soweth in blessings, shall also reap of blessings."—2 Cor. ix. 6.

He then who soweth so sparingly in this world as to remain, in his dying moment, indebted to the Divine justice, will after his death be compelled to pay to the last farthing what, by more serious endeavours, he might have paid in this world.

You will, I hope, excuse the length of this letter; I could not make it shorter; and you, Mr. Editor, have inquired so often for those authorities that I have produced from the first, second, and third centuries, &c., for the support of our doctrine, that I think in fairness you ought to insert it, and give your readers a view of what is to be said on the other side. I am a constant reader of your pages.

I remain, sir, your humble and obedient servant,

JOHN DUFFY.

We have to apologize to Mr. Duffy for having postponed inserting the above letter, though in type a considerable time, in consequence of the great pressure of other matter.

If our correspondent be, as he says, a constant reader of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN he must be aware that the two subjects to which his letter relates—purgatory, and prayers for the dead—are perfectly distinct, and he must know that it is useless to endeavour to prove the antiquity of the doctrine of purgatory by passages which merely speak of prayers for the departed. We admit that the practice of prayers for the dead was introduced into the Church at an early period, though not in the first century; but we confidently deny that any support can be got for the doctrine of purgatory from the writings of orthodox Fathers of the three first centuries. In the early Church, prayers were made for the departed, not indeed that God would deliver their souls from purgatory, but that He would give them a blessed sentence in the day of judgment; that He would hasten the resurrection, and so on. These prayers were offered, in fact, for the greatest saints, those whom no one ever supposed to have been in purgatory, for the apostles and martyrs, and even for the Virgin Mary herself. We could show this abundantly by citations from the Fathers, and the ancient liturgies; but we must not weary our readers by recurring to a point which has been frequently insisted on, and we conceive fully established in the pages of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Let us proceed to consider the passages adduced by our correspondent. The first quotation is from Tertullian; and here we may remark that the heading of our correspondent's letter, "Purgatory, and the practice of praying for the dead, proved from the Fathers of the first, second, and third centuries, &c.," is scarcely appropriate, because, as will presently be seen, there is no passage cited from the genuine works of any writer earlier than Tertullian, who was born in the middle of the second century. Let us see, however, what is the value of Tertullian's evidence. The first passage is from his *Treatise de Anima*, c. 58. "No man will doubt but that the soul doth recompense something in the places below." Now, will our correspondent believe us when we state that the great Roman Catholic controversialist, Bellarmine, brands as heretical the views as to the state of the departed, put forward by Tertullian in this same *Treatise de Anima*, and in the very chapter from which the above quotation is taken. Such, however, is the case (see Bellarmine, *de Ecclesia Triumphantia*, l. 1.); but as we Protestants would not be much influenced by Bellarmine's decision, as to what was or was not heresy, we must explain why we attach no importance to this assertion of Tertullian. There lived in the second

century a man named Montanus, who made a considerable stir in the Church. He took up the monstrous notion that he was himself the COMFORTER promised by Christ to his disciples, and he pretended to be able to prophesy, under the influence of divine inspiration. Notwithstanding the absurdity of this and other opinions which he held, he had many followers, and, among others, Tertullian. Now, in the very next sentence to that quoted by our correspondent, Tertullian justifies the assertion he has made by a reference to Montanus, under the name of the Comforter! Can it be maintained that a statement so supported is deserving of any attention?

The next passage is also from Tertullian, from his *Book de Corona Militis*.—"We make yearly oblations for the dead." Though this passage might be cited to prove the practice of prayer for the dead in Tertullian's time, it is obvious that it does not bear at all on the doctrine of purgatory.

The next passage—that from Clement—we are unable to verify, as our correspondent has given us no reference; but we have no doubt that he means to refer to the first of the series of epistles of Clement, of Rome, to St. James, which epistles are now universally admitted to be spurious. As our attention has been directed to this letter, we think it worth while to give an extract, which will show that, even in the late period at which this forgery was perpetrated, no idea of a purgatory, such as is now believed in by Roman Catholics had entered into the Church. The following words are put by the writer of the epistle into the mouth of St. Peter (p. 7, L. Paris ed., 1544), "With regard to those who could not completely fulfil the rule of righteousness, but have left some traces of wickedness, their bodies, indeed, are dissolved, but their souls are preserved in joyful and happy places, that in the resurrection of the dead, when they have been reunited to their bodies, purified by the very dissolution, they may enjoy their eternal inheritance for the good deeds they have done." From this it would appear that in those comparatively late times no means of purification after death were believed in, beyond bestowing on the risen souls purified and glorified bodies in place of their present ones. It is obvious, too, that the passage of the pseudo-Clement, which our correspondent has quoted, even if it were genuine, would not give the least support to purgatory.

A well-known passage from Cyprian is next quoted; but if our correspondent will refer to the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. ii., p. 68, June, 1853, he will find the true meaning of this passage, as explained by a learned Roman Catholic commentator, and he will see that it has no reference whatever to purgatory.

The next passage is from Origen. Here again we must refer our correspondent to former discussions in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN (see vol. ii., pp. 56, 67, 105). If he will take the trouble of consulting the articles referred to, he will see what were Origen's views as to the punishments of a future life, and how they differed from the modern Romish doctrine of purgatory; he will learn, moreover, that Origen was condemned as heretical on this very point.

Our correspondent next cites passages from Ambrose, Cyril, and Jerome, who, as every one knows, flourished in the fourth century. As Mr. Duffy's object was to prove purgatory and prayers for the dead from the Fathers of the three first centuries, it would be as irrelevant for us to discuss, as it was for him to introduce, quotations from writers of the fourth century. However, if it was desirable, something might be said about all these passages too.

Let us now review the proofs which our correspondent has brought forward—that purgatory and prayers for the dead were held and taught by the Fathers of the first three centuries. He does not quote a single passage from the genuine remains of any Father of the first century. Of the passages from writers of the second or third centuries, two only seem to give any support to the doctrine of purgatory, and neither of these from orthodox Fathers. The remaining passages quoted, either have no reference to purgatory, or are taken from writers later than the third century. Mr. Duffy does not profess to be a scholar, and he may say, that if he was, he could furnish more ample evidence of the truth of his opinions; but we can assure him that, if he had the learning of Bellarmine, the evidence for purgatory, which he could extract from writers of the first three centuries, would be meagre in the extreme.

Our correspondent has given no quotation from any of the genuine works of the Apostolic Fathers. In truth, it would be impossible to find in their writings any proof of the doctrine of purgatory. Surely, their silence on this doctrine, of such vast importance if true, is very remarkable. It may be said, that to argue from their silence is not very convincing; but there are cases in which the silence of a writer on a subject may be a most conclusive proof that he knew nothing about it. If the introduction of a topic be necessary or pertinent, the fact of its not being introduced goes a long way to show that the writer was ignorant of everything about it. Now, we could refer to passages in the Apostolic Fathers where the mention of purgatory could hardly have failed to be introduced, if the existence of it had been known or believed in at the time. For instance, Clement, when expressly treating of death and the resurrection (I. Ep. ad